

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

IN RE: Silas R. & Buleah K. Fuller)
Dist. 11, Map 9H, Group B, Control Map 9H, Parcel 1.00) Blount County
Dist. 11, Map 9H, Group C, Control Map 9H, Parcel 6.00)
Residential Property)
Tax Year 2006)

INITIAL DECISION AND ORDER

Statement of the Case

The subject property is presently valued as follows:

Parcel 1.00

<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>IMPROVEMENT VALUE</u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
\$30,900	\$87,100	\$118,000	\$29,500

Parcel 6.00

<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>IMPROVEMENT VALUE</u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
\$31,200	\$111,200	\$142,400	\$35,600

An appeal has been filed on behalf of the property owner with the State Board of Equalization. The undersigned administrative judge conducted a hearing in this matter on November 14, 2006 in Maryville, Tennessee. In attendance at the hearing were Silas Fuller, the appellant, Mike Morton, Blount County Assessor, and staff appraiser Phil Williams.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Subject property consists of two single family residences located on Scenic Hill Drive in Louisville, Tennessee.

The taxpayer contended that parcels 1 and 6 should be valued at \$108,000 and \$130,000 respectively. In support of this position, the taxpayer argued that subject property experiences a loss in value because four homes in the neighborhood are utilized by Cornerstone Drug Recovery. In addition, the taxpayer asserted that both homes have numerous physical problems which also cause a diminution in value. Finally, Mr. Fuller testified that five houses are presently being offered for sale in the neighborhood.

The assessor contended that parcels 1 and 6 should remain valued at \$118,000 and \$142,400. In support of this position, four comparable sales were introduced into evidence. Mr. Williams maintained that subject homes are both currently appraised at significantly less than the market values indicated by the comparables. Mr. Williams asserted that any loss in value due to external obsolescence or physical deterioration has been adequately considered.

The basis of valuation as stated in Tennessee Code Annotated Section 67-5-601(a) is that "[t]he value of all property shall be ascertained from the evidence of its sound, intrinsic and immediate value, for purposes of sale between a willing seller and a willing buyer without consideration of speculative values . . ."

After having reviewed all the evidence in the case, the administrative judge finds that parcels 1 and 6 should be valued at \$118,000 and \$142,400 as contended by the assessor of property.

Since the taxpayer is appealing from the determination of the Blount County Board of Equalization, the burden of proof is on the taxpayer. See State Board of Equalization Rule 0600-1-.11(1) and *Big Fork Mining Company v. Tennessee Water Quality Control Board*, 620 S.W.2d 515 (Tenn. App. 1981).

The administrative judge finds that comparable sales normally constitute the best evidence of the market value of a residence. As noted by the Assessment Appeals Commission in *E.B. Kissell, Jr.* (Shelby County, Tax Years 1991 and 1992):

The best evidence of the present value of a residential property is generally sales of properties comparable to the subject, comparable in features relevant to value. Perfect comparability is not required, but relevant differences should be explained and accounted for by reasonable adjustments. If evidence of a sale is presented without the required analysis of comparability, it is difficult or impossible for us to use the sale as an indicator of value. . . .

Final Decision and Order at 2. The administrative judge finds that the taxpayer did not introduce any comparable sales into evidence. The assessor, in contrast, introduced four comparable sales which were adjusted in accordance with generally accepted appraisal practices.

The administrative judge finds merely reciting factors that could cause a diminution in value does not establish the current appraisal exceeds market value. The administrative judge finds the Assessment Appeals Commission has ruled on numerous occasions that one must *quantify* the loss in value one contends has not been adequately considered. See, e.g., *Fred & Ann Ruth Honeycutt* (Carter Co., Tax Year 1995) wherein the Assessment Appeals Commission ruled that the taxpayer introduced insufficient evidence to quantify the loss in value from the stigma associated with a gasoline spill. The Commission stated in pertinent part as follows:

The assessor conceded that the gasoline spill affected the value of the property, but he asserted that his valuation already reflects a deduction of 15% for the effects of the spill. . . . The administrative judge rejected Mr. Honeycutt's claim for an additional reduction in the taxable value, noting that he had not produced evidence by which to quantify the effect of the "stigma." The Commission finds itself in the same position. . . .

Conceding that the marketability of a property may be affected by contamination of a neighboring property, we must have proof that allows us to quantify the loss in value, such as sales of comparable properties. . . Absent this proof here we must accept as sufficient, the assessor's attempts to reflect environmental condition in the present value of the property.

Final Decision and Order at 1-2. Similarly, in *Kenneth R. and Rebecca L. Adams* (Shelby Co., Tax Year 1998) the Commission ruled in relevant part as follows:

The taxpayer also claimed that the land value set by the assessing authorities. . . was too high. In support of that position, she claimed that. . . the use of surrounding property detracted from the value of their property. . . . As to the assertion the use of properties has a detrimental effect on the value of the subject property, that assertion, without some valid method of quantifying the same, is meaningless.

Final Decision and Order at 2.

ORDER

It is therefore ORDERED that the following values and assessments be adopted for tax year 2006:

Parcel 1.00

<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>IMPROVEMENT VALUE</u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
\$30,900	\$87,100	\$118,000	\$29,500

Parcel 6.00

<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>IMPROVEMENT VALUE</u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
\$31,200	\$111,200	\$142,400	\$35,600

It is FURTHER ORDERED that any applicable hearing costs be assessed pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501(d) and State Board of Equalization Rule 0600-1-.17.

Pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act, Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 4-5-301—325, Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501, and the Rules of Contested Case Procedure of the State Board of Equalization, the parties are advised of the following remedies:


1. A party may appeal this decision and order to the Assessment Appeals Commission pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501 and Rule 0600-1-.12 of the Contested Case Procedures of the State Board of Equalization. Tennessee Code Annotated § 67-5-1501(c) provides that an appeal “**must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date the initial decision is sent.**” Rule 0600-1-.12 of the Contested Case Procedures of the State Board of Equalization provides that the appeal be filed with the Executive Secretary of the State Board and that the appeal “**identify the allegedly erroneous finding(s) of fact and/or conclusion(s) of law in the initial order**”; or
2. A party may petition for reconsideration of this decision and order pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-5-317 within fifteen (15) days of the entry of the order.

The petition for reconsideration must state the specific grounds upon which relief is requested. The filing of a petition for reconsideration is not a prerequisite for seeking administrative or judicial review; or

3. A party may petition for a stay of effectiveness of this decision and order pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-5-316 within seven (7) days of the entry of the order.

This order does not become final until an official certificate is issued by the Assessment Appeals Commission. Official certificates are normally issued seventy-five (75) days after the entry of the initial decision and order if no party has appealed.

ENTERED this 21st day of November, 2006.



MARK J. MINSKY
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES DIVISION

c: Silas R & Buleah K. Fuller
Mike Morton, Assessor of Property